

**Minutes of the Meeting
November 6, 1997**

Projects Reviewed

Seattle Children's Theater Addition
Fun Forest Maintenance Building
Waterfront South
East Pike Street at 10th and 11th Avenues

Convened: 8:00 am

Adjourned: 1:30pm

Commissioners Present

Barbara Swift, Chair
Moe Batra
Gail Dubrow
Robert Foley
Gerald Hansmire
Jon Layzer
Rick Sundberg

Staff Present

Marcia Wagoner
Peter Aylsworth
Rebecca Walls

110697.1 Project: **Seattle Children's Theater Addition**
 Phase: Schematics
 Presenters: Dave Buchan, Seattle Center
 Sherrill Myers, LMN Architects
 Thomas Pechar, Seattle Children's Theater
 Paul Brenna, The Brenna Co.
 Jennifer Hing, LMN Architects
 John Nesholm, LMN Architects
 Mark Reddington, LMN Architects
 Time: .5 hr. (hourly)

The Seattle Children's Theater is adding a new scene shop, rehearsal space, and costume/prop spaces to the south side of the existing structure. The entire addition is funded 100% by the Children's Theater through donations. The south facade of the addition will front onto a major public entrance to the Seattle Center between the Pacific Science Center and the Theater.

The primary program spaces are organized in a glazed volume of loft spaces making the interior activities visible on the exterior. By making the facade transparent the addition will have more of a presence on the south side and feel less like the back side of the Theater. The scene shop is on the first floor, rehearsal spaces are on the second floor, and the costume/prop spaces are on the third floor. The noisier program spaces, such as a wood and metal shop, will be placed to the sides of the loft space and unglazed. The existing loading area will be reused and a gate will be added to screen the function from the street.

Discussion:

Sundberg: How high is the base under the scene shop?

Myer: The exact height is undecided, but it will either be low enough to sit on or high enough to lean on.

Sundberg: I think it is a nice idea to make the interior of the scene shop visible to pedestrians.

Hansmire: How high is the scene shop?

Myer: It is approximately 26 feet, the entire loft space is approximately 65 feet.

Hansmire: How transparent is the loft space?

Sundberg: There are great opportunities for the space in terms of the combination of glass and

lighting to develop a dialogue with the Science Center. Perhaps the transparency is reduced through textured glass panels in the upper portions of the facade.

Swift: You say transparent. Does that mean quasi-translucent or clear? Will it have a shadowy effect?

Myers: It will be a flecked glazing, giving some transparency and shadowy feel. Natural light is the best kind of light for the scene shop.

Swift: The buildings at the Seattle Center share the same kinds of problems that the buildings on campuses share. What would typically have a front door, back door, service side, and a public side, gets blurred so that each side is a public side. One of the things that I love about the Seattle Center, which I think you are starting to develop, is that the delineation between front door and back door sides is broken down. This means that the kind of magical hidden experiences must be created. The addition requires a similar level of detail and texture as that found on the existing building. Somehow the friendly, crafted, child-oriented textures could leak out where pedestrians interact. I am suggesting that might be a tool to blur the front door/ back door quality of the building.

Myer: That is an interesting point because we have the public expression, service expression, and then we have the stage door, and they are all different. It is a complex building.

Swift: You are designing a building with front doors on all sides.

Dubrow: There seems to be a lack of detail and animation at the upper bands of the loft space. Perhaps more ornamentation, color, texture in a decorative band at the upper levels is needed. It needs something playful that brings the same kind of attention to the upper levels as that at the scene shop level.

Wagoner: It reminds me of the canal substation where the artist has shadow figure images in the windows. Perhaps you could draw on the character of some of the signature art pieces in the Children's Theater and integrate that in the building parts.

Dubrow: You could use some sort of symbolic representation of the costume shop on the exterior to give more life to that entire facade.

Batra: What is the space at the east end of the addition?

Myer: It could either become part of the children's court garden or it could be the stage door location.

Hansmire: Since this addition fronts on a major Seattle Center entry area I think that the idea of relating the addition to the walkway is a good. I think that this design is a good start and agree that increased animation at the upper levels is needed.

Dubrow: Bringing the band down from the top would make a lower visual focus and be in keeping with your idea of bringing the scale of the facade down in the tight corridor. Revealing the functions inside the building would also help the scale be diminished.

Swift: I wonder, as you develop the structure of the building, how the structure is going to read through to the exterior and what kind of layering effect it will have?

Myer: Right now it is going to be a steel frame building so the structure will be visible through to the outside.

ACTION: **The Commission recommends approval of the schematic design as presented. the Commission suggests that the following areas be addressed; refine the walkway between the Science Center and the addition's facade to make it a really attractive pedestrian space, diminish the scale of the upper parts of the building, maintaining a friendly, inviting space with detail and texture.**

110697.2 **Project:** **Fun Forest Maintenance Building**
 Phase: Design Development
Presenters: Dave Buchan, Seattle Center
 John Taylor, Callison Architecture
 Stacey Hooper, Callison Architecture
Attendees: Jeff Benesi, Hewitt Isley
 Tom Berger, The Berger Partnership
 Jerry Ernst, Consultant
Time: .5 hr. (hourly)

This project is in the second phase of four total. The major program functions are the Fun Forest maintenance shop and a coffee shop. The building must be sensitive to the adjacent monorail and visibility from above as well as the character of the Fun Forest. It is a simple metal building with a polychromatic color scheme and light monitors on the roof. The maintenance facility will have two roll-up doors. The project necessitates removing and replacing the existing poplar trees between the monorail and the proposed building.

Discussion:

- Buchan:** We were concerned about the loss of vegetation beside the monorail. The landscape mitigation plan requires the Fun Forest to replace all lost plantings.
- Swift:** The species of tree is not as important as the scale of the trees. The poplars are the right scale needed for that location. What is the scale of the proposed trees.
- Berger:** They are Armstrong maples. They will be large scale and colorful, corridor type trees.
- Swift:** In regards to the flat roof, I suggest that you have fun with it. There is a place in Woodenville that recycles stained glass into a gravel. This material could be used instead of gravel to give color and character. Since the roof is seen from above it is important to consider it aesthetically.
- Layzer:** I am concerned about the cleaning issues with the maples over the roof, dropping leaves in the gravel.
- Taylor:** We will look into that, but it hasn't been a problem so far.
- Hansmire:** Does the metal wall cladding extend down to grade? The first three to four feet high will take a lot of abuse. Perhaps you should investigate a base material for that area that is more durable.
- Taylor:** It has a base now approximately six inches high.
- Sundberg:** How high are the light monitors on the roof?
- Taylor:** They are approximately five feet high. There is also a required parapet around the perimeter of the building for fire protection.
- Sundberg:** I suggest that they be kept up if possible. They could also have some interesting night lighting. Have fun with this project. The composition could be a little more playful, more colors on the facades. Being next to the Fun Forest and the future EMP, there is room to be playful.
- Dubrow:** I recommend that another color be added to the facade. It needs a transition color between the purple fascia and the gray walls.
- Layzer:** Are there any functional conflicts with the Center House entrance and this project? What is the patio paving relationship with this entrance?
- Buchan:** It has a similar paving area as what now exists. The patio area will be in front of the entrance, but with plenty of space for access. The patio will be paved with concrete pavers, while the access to the Center House will have the standard asphalt paving.
- Dubrow:** Will there be adequate space for entry and seating in the patio area?

Taylor: There is an eight foot circulation space between the coffee shop and the trellis. The trellis is 12 feet wide, with another eight feet on the north side.

Action: **The Commission recommends approval of the project as presented. The Commission appreciates the extensive presentation and makes the following recommendations:**

- **given the location next the Fun Forest and the EMP, consider a more lively color scheme on the facade, adding another color at the windows and doors,**
- **consider crushed stained glass on the roof instead of gravel,**
- **create interesting lighting in the monitors,**
- **ensure that the value engineering results in quality materials,**
- **treat the base of the building with a more durable material.**

110697.3	<p>Project: Waterfront South</p> <p>Phase: EIS Alternative</p> <p>Presenters: Tim King, CH2MhillWSDOT Dennis Haskell, Hewitt Isley Warren Ingersoll, Port of Seattle Steve Pearce, Office of Management and Planning Mike Anderson, Washington State Ferries</p> <p>Attendees: Denice Hunt, Office of Management and Planning Nancy Ousley, Office of Management and Planning Joe Taskey, Seattle Transportation</p> <p>Time: 1 hr.</p>
----------	---

In May of 1997 cost estimates for the project were presented, for the first time, to the Policy Oversight Committee. These cost estimates were found to be too high and the Department of Transportation was charged with refocusing them back on transportation goals. In October, after revised cost analyses, the Oversight Committee authorized starting the EIS process. A Citizens Advisory Committee has been formed to develop community involvement. This committee was briefed on the original plan and also on the revised plan.

The Waterfront South project is about to begin the scoping process and EIS procedures. A list of goals, primary and secondary, was prepared to provide guidance as the project proceeds. Economic factors are not indicated as primary goals in order to avoid having to make financial decisions that compromise other goals. The primary goal is to minimize life-cycle costs. Since the ferry terminals were built at the same time 30 years ago, they are in need of repair at the same time now. Costs just to maintain these terminals are very high.

This project has changed over the last six months. Some of the added alternatives include major entrances in line with city streets, three routes to downtown, and a sorting area on city owned property north of Royal Brougham. Another substantial change is the location of the passenger only ferry. It could be moved to piers 55 or 56. A survey showed that some were in favor of this location, which has advantageous connections with downtown but creates a decentralized ferry facility.

Discussion:

Dubrow: How do these goals mesh with the urban design guidelines? How do you intend to fuse the functions into the fabric of the waterfront? I don't see that mentioned in the

- goal statement.
- King:** I don't think that those ideas will be lost, but we are not yet at that stage of development. We are currently trying to evaluate the environmental impacts on the area.
- Dubrow:** I think it should be a primary goal, equal in importance to the other primary goals listed.
- Layzer:** This project has an impact on the overall size, shape of the waterfront buildings. It's fit into the waterfront rhythm is therefore important.
- Swift:** This seems to be a completely different project from what we looked at last. This is a transportation driven project. Are there opportunities for non-transportation driven fund raising?
- King:** The current ferry terminal is in a state of distress. There is a lot of work that needs to be done in the next five years. We need to get a 20 year scope in order to do improvements to Coleman Dock.
- Foley:** Did the alternatives appear more attractive from a life-cycle cost perspective?
- King:** We didn't have the life-cycle costs then. Total costs were the major issue.
- Foley:** What is the program for pier 48?
- King:** The Port is looking for minimal use of this pier, preferably passenger-only use. It could include some retail and room for future development.
- Swift:** What is the bottom line in terms of cost and schedule?
- King:** We hope to complete the EIS next year and begin design of individual projects with a 20-30 year development term. There will be an off-site holding area, removal of the dock, and a remodeling of the terminal into a more public facility. The cost is 200 million dollars phased in over time. Phase one is approximately 128 million with 38 million currently funded.
- Foley:** Will the off-site holding area create or increase conflicts with trains or downtown traffic?
- King:** We are trying to remove conflicts by keeping traffic in dedicated lanes. SR519 will eliminate conflicts with the railroad.
- Pearce:** Since there is no other choice but the south approach to the terminal, a remote holding area is a way to control and minimize traffic problems around the stadiums.
- Layzer:** My major concern is the open space and how you plan to address the view corridors. You seem to have addressed programmatic issues of the waterfront only.
- King:** The code is forcing us to design pocket parks and unusable spaces. We would like a connection of the open spaces and the upper Coleman dock.
- Dubrow:** We should be talking about principles driving the design rather than detailed designs.
- Haskell:** These drawings show code compliance plans only. They were only used to evaluate code specific criteria to determine feasibility.
- Dubrow:**
- Swift:** We seem to have a range of questions. A more detailed briefing of the project might allow us to function as advocates for a more urban approach.
- Layzer:** We could be more supportive if there was an effort to meet the intent of the code, rather than the letter of the code.
- King:** We started this process over one year ago with an open mind. Now something has to happen. If the things people want take time, this project will need an advocate to support the extended time frame.
- Haskell:** We started with the attitude that it was a cooperative effort, but there has been a lack of support. Now we need to proceed for the sake of the ferry system.
- Swift:** I think I am hearing Commission interest in helping this project really develop quality

urban design. We need to better understand all the functions and issues associated with the project.

Sundberg: Perhaps we could have a briefing on the functions and program of the project.

King: We could schedule a time to give you a fuller briefing; the earlier, the better. We need to move ahead with the process.

Dubrow: Within the sets of goals, is there room for amendment? They seem to ignore the character of the waterfront. This project needs to protect the sources of historic character of the waterfront. Is there room to weight the historic issues with the functional issues?

King: These goals are based on the charge to refocus the project back on transportation. There will be some trade-offs based on the amount of improvements and the amount of funds available.

Foley: This project seems to address transportation and code issues, but not urban design issues. I would like to see some alternatives respond to the major urban design opportunities.

King: We are in the process of refining alternatives. This presentation was for reaction and comments not for approval. You have raised good points and issues.

Action: **The Commission greatly appreciates the briefing and understands the complexity of the project. The Commission would like another presentation soon. It is an important project with long-term impacts on the ferry system and the city. The Commission is interested in aggressive pursuit of this project and its facilitation as an excellent urban design. The Commission recognizes the transportation issues but requires that urban design principles and goals be equal to the transportation goals. The state has a responsibility to protect historic resources and the waterfront fabric should be viewed as a historic resource directly affecting this project. The Commission may be interested in discussing the code issues as they pertain to urban design goals**

The Commission would appreciate a briefing by DCLU on the system plan, and transportation issues.

110697.4	Project:	East Pike Street at 10th & 11th Avenues
	Phase:	Decorative Paving Project Briefing
	Presenters:	Shauna Walgren, Seattle Transportation Anne Van Dyne, Tangent
	Time:	.5 hr. (hourly)

This project consists of street improvements on Pike Street. An informal Master Plan was developed through a design charette process. Proposed are curb bulbs at the intersections made of clay tile and granite paving. There is a matching grant for decorative tile and the City is encouraging business owners to organize matching grants as well as improvement ideas.

Discussion:

Foley: What kind of trees were planted on the north/south streets?

Van Dyne: They are all blossoming trees of varying types intermixed with existing trees; purple plum, hawthorn, and crabapple.

Swift: I like the idiosyncratic character of this project. What is really important is that the

- character of a community is revealed.
- Walgren: We are still in the process of testing the material ability of the pavers to withstand pressure and slipping. We have a feeling it will work.
- Dubrow: If it doesn't, what is your back-up?
- Walgren: In that case we would use colored concrete pavers.

Action: Briefing only, no action required . The Commission appreciates the presentation.

110697.5Commission Business

Action Items

- A. MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 1997 : Approved as amended.
- B. SUBCOMMITTEE FOR BROAD STREET IMPROVEMENTS: Alternatives need presented to full Commission.

Discussion Items

- C. WSCTC REVIEW: November 20th.
- D. BRIEFING PAPER: Read reported on draft.
- E. MUNICIPAL CAMPUS UPDATE: Subcommittee and staff reported on the final recommendations, the upcoming meeting, and consultant selection.
- F. CONVENTION CENTER DESIGN COMMITTEE: Sundberg reported on October 22nd meeting, Swift reported on Design Principles revision.
- G. "STREETS" WORKSHOP: Layzer reported.
- H. KING STREET IMPROVEMENTS CONSULTANT SELECTION: Layzer reported.
- I. DCLU DESIGN REVIEW RESPONSE LETTER: Foley reported.
- J. Retreat Location and Agenda Items: Wagoner reported.
- K. Regional Trends Workshop: November 14th, sponsored by DUCPUG.
- L. Regional TRA Workshop: Wagoner reported.
- M. North Cascades Environmental Educational Center: Foley reported.